REMARKS

I. Introductory Comments

Claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-23 are pending in this application. In the Office Action dated February 11, 2008, claims 1, 2, 4, and 19 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by Meier (US Patent No. 6,407,991). Claims 5-15, 17-18, and 20-23 were rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over Meier in view of one or a combination of Kirani, et al (US Publication No. 2002/0032027), Fong, et al (US Patent No. 7,061,385), West (US Patent No. 5,574,979), or Helgeson (US Patent No. 6,727,816).

Claims 1, 15, and 19 have been amended, and support for the amendments can be found at least at paragraph 0025 in the specification as filed. In light of the amendments and arguments contained herein, it is respectfully submitted that the rejections of the claims be withdrawn. As Applicant's remarks with respect to the Examiner's rejections are sufficient to overcome these rejections, Applicant's silence as to assertions by the Examiner in the Office Action or certain requirements that may be applicable to such rejections (e.g., whether a reference constitutes prior art, motivation to combine references, assertions as to dependent claims, etc.) is not a concession by Applicant that such assertions are accurate or such requirements have been met, and Applicant reserves the right to analyze and dispute such assertions/requirements in the future.

II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1 and 19 under §102(b). Consequently, the references cited by the Examiner fail to anticipate each element of claims 2 and 4 under §102(b). Furthermore, the references cited by the Examiner fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103(a) with regard to claims 5-14, and 20-23.

Claim 1, as amended, recites a multinode arrangement for establishing a communication network for transmitting information between a first object and a second object having:

> a plurality of nodes defining a plurality of node pairs;
> wherein the plurality of nodes includes at least a first node and a second node defining one of the plurality of node pairs, wherein the first node and the second node are connected by and communicate through a hardwire connection; and

> wherein the plurality of nodes includes at least a third node in another of the plurality of node pairs that communicates with at least the first node or the second node through an RF communication link; and
>
> wherein said first node is configured to refrain from communicating with one of said second node and said third node for a predetermined amount of time in response to said second node and said third node communicating with one another.

Claim 19, as amended recites a method for providing a communication network between a first object and a second object having the steps of:

> providing a plurality of node pairs, wherein each of the node pairs comprises at least two nodes that are connected by and communicate through a hardwire connection;
>
> distributing the plurality of node pairs between the first object and the second object;
>
> establishing a communication network by linking nodes of node pairs with nodes of other node pairs, wherein the linking comprises RF communication links; and
>
> configuring one of said nodes to refrain from communicating with at least two other nodes for a predetermined amount of time in response to said two other nodes communicating with one another.

Notably, claim 1 now recites the first node being "configured to refrain from communicating with one of said second node and said third node for a predetermined amount of time in response to said second node and said third node communicating with one another." Claim 19 now recites the method including the step of "configuring one of said nodes to refrain from communicating with at least two other nodes for a predetermined amount of time in response to said two other nodes communicating with one another."

Meier fails to disclose each element of claims 1 and 19. At best, Meier discloses that "any network node can determine whether any other network node exists…." Col. 8, lines 14-16. However, this disclosure by Meier fails to teach or suggest the first node being "configured to refrain from communicating with one of said second node and said third node for a predetermined amount of time in response to said second node and said third node communicating with one another" in claim 1, or the step of "configuring one of said nodes to refrain from communicating with at least two other nodes for a predetermined amount of time in response to said two other

nodes communicating with one another" in claim 19. Accordingly, claims 1 and 19 are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner. Furthermore, claims 2, 4-14, and 20-23 depend either directly or indirectly from claim 1 or 19 and are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner for at least the same reason.

III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

For the following reasons, Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 15 under 35 USC §103(a). Consequently, the references cited by the Examiner fail to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness under §103(a) with regard to claims 17-18.

Claim 15, as amended, recites a multinode arrangement for establishing a communication network for transmitting information between a first object and a second object having:

> a communication means for communicating information from the first object to the second object across a plurality of nodes that communicate through at least one of RF and hardwire communication links;
>
> a reestablishing means for reestablishing a communication link between at least two of the plurality of nodes when an original communication link between the two of the plurality of nodes is broken; and
>
> a collision prevention means for preventing interference of communications between one node and at least two other nodes for a predetermined amount of time in response to said two other nodes communicating with one another.

Notably, claim 15 now recites "a collision prevention means for preventing interference of communications between one node and at least two other nodes for a predetermined amount of time in response to said two other nodes communicating with one another."

The references cited by the Examiner, alone or in combination, fail to disclose the elements of claim 15. As discussed above, at best, Meier discloses that "any network node can determine whether any other network node exists…." Col. 8, lines 14-16. At best, Fong discloses that "if tether signals are lost, signal scanning… may be used to re-establish a signal communication." Col. 112, lines 12-14. Whether taken alone or in combination, the disclosures of Meier and Fong fail to teach or suggest "a collision prevention means for preventing interference of communications between one node and at least two other nodes for a predetermined amount of time in response to said two other nodes communicating with one another." Accordingly, claim 15 is patentable over the

references cited by the Examiner. Furthermore, claims 17-18 depend either directly or indirectly on claim 15 and are patentable over the references cited by the Examiner for at least the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendment, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. 65632-0176 from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: May 12, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

Electronic signature: /Glenn E. Forbis/
Glenn E. Forbis
Registration No.: 40,610
RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC
Correspondence Customer Number: 25537
Attorney for Applicant